

REMARKS

Information Disclosure Statements

It was pointed out in the Office Action that the September 25, 2006 Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) did not comply with 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because several foreign documents submitted with the IDS were not accompanied by a concise explanation of their relevance. Applicants respectfully point out that they submitted at least English language Abstracts of the documents on September 25, 2006. For the Examiner's convenience, copies of such Abstracts are re-submitted with the IDS filed with this Amendment.

It was also pointed out in the Office Action that reference 1 in the June 29, 2007 IDS did not have a publication date. Applicants state that the publication date of that reference is June 2000. The Supplemental IDS will follow.

Oath/Declaration

An executed supplemental declaration is filed concurrently with this Amendment, in response to the assertion in the Office Action that the previously-submitted oath or declaration was defective.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to because it was asserted that Figures 1 and 2 included the reference character S_2 and Figure 8 the character L_c , which were not mentioned in the specification.

Applicants submit corrected Figures 1 and 2, which do not have the character S_2 .

Applicants respectfully submit that the character L_c is described in the specification, e.g., at page 26, paragraph 0095.

Applicants also submit a replacement Figure 9. Which includes a reference F, which is discussed in the specification.

Abstract

The Abstract was objected to because it did not appear to be in completely narrative in form. Applicants enclose a revised Abstract, which Applicants submit is in proper form.

Amendments

Claims 28, 32 and 33 are amended, support therefor being found in the specification, considered as a whole, e.g., Fig. 1 and pages 6-7. Support for new claim 36 is also found in the specification considered as a whole, e.g., at page 6, paragraph 0012 and paragraph 0036 at pages 12 -13. No new matter is introduced.

Claim Rejections -35 USC §112

Claims 28 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failure to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claims prior to their amendment herein were definite. The amended claims continue to be definite.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 102(e)

Claims 28, 32 and 33 were rejected as anticipated by Van Beuningen et al., US 2006/0234229 (Van Beuningen). The Examiner pointed out that Van Beuningen describes that a biotin (i.e., a labeling substance) can further be attached to an analyte, which can be peptides (i.e., a probe substance) through a linker (i.e., an organic compound).

However, this assertion is misdirected. In Van Beuningen, the linker is used not to bind the biotin (labeling substance) to the analyte (probe substance) but to immobilize target-molecules on a solid substrate. See paragraphs 0082-0085.

Further, the complex consisting of the analyte, the biotin, and an avidin-label conjugate in Van Beuningen is used just to detect the analyte (probe substance), which is captured by the target-molecule immobilized on the solid surface.

To the contrary, the chimeric substance of Applicants' invention functions as a reversibly detachable bridge between a biological substance to be captured and an antibody immobilized

on the solid surface. The reversibly detachable bridge makes it possible to dissociate, dilute and recover the biological substance.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit their claimed method is novel in view of Van Beuningen, e. g., because of elements bonded to each other by the organic compound (or the linker) and how the chimeric substance functions to recover the biological substance in Applicants' invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication of which is solicited. In the event any outstanding issues remain, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact their undersigned counsel to resolve such issues in an expeditious manner and place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees connected with this filing, which may be required now, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2478 (039371-20).

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas W. Cole/

Date: February 28, 2011

Thomas W. Cole
Registration No. 28,290

Customer No. 25570

Roberts Mlotkowski Safran & Cole, P.C.
P.O. Box 10064
McLean, VA 22102
Phone No.: (703) 584-3270 x 219
Direct: (703) 677-3001
Fax No.: (703) 848-2981